UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,737	09/30/2004	Lee George LABORCZFALVI	2006579-0141	5736

69665 7590 08/22/2007

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC.
TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER	
MORRISON, JAY A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/711,737	LABORCZFALVI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jay A. Morrison	2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 June 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. Claims 1-32 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Czajkowski (Patent Number 6,938,247 B2).

As per claim 1, Czajkowski teaches

A method for isolating access by application programs to native resources provided by an operating system, the method comprising the steps of: (see abstract and background)

(a) redirecting to an isolation environment comprising a user isolation scope and an application isolation scope a request for a native resource made by a process

executing on behalf of a first user; (fields prone to interference are replicated and isolated for each application, column 13, lines 10-18)

(b) locating an instance of the requested native resource in the user isolation scope on behalf of a first user; (proper instance accessed based on application identity, column 13, lines 5-8)

and (c) responding to the request for the native resource using the instance of the required native resource located in the user isolation scope. (proper instance accessed based on application identity, column 13, lines 1-18; applications may include system services, column 12, lines 10-15)

As per claim 2, Czajkowski teaches

step (b) comprises failing to locate an instance of the requested native resource in the user isolation scope. (column 12, lines 22-35)

As per claim 3, Czajkowski teaches

step (c) comprises redirecting the request to the application isolation scope. (column 12,lines 36-46)

As per claim 4, Czajkowski teaches

(d) locating an instance of the requested native resource in the application isolation scope; (column 13, lines 25-30)

and responding to the request for the native resource using the instance of the requested native resource located in the application isolation scope. (column 13, lines 20-30)

As per claim 5, Czajkowski teaches

step (e) comprises creating an instance of the requested native resource in the user isolation scope that corresponds to the instance of the requested native resource located in the application isolation scope and responding to the request for the native resource using the instance of the requested native resource created in the user isolation scope. (column 12, lines 19-37)

As per claim 6, Czajkowski teaches

step (d) comprises failing to locate an instance of the requested native resource in the application isolation scope. (column 13, lines 15-22)

As per claim 7, Czajkowski teaches

step (e) comprises responding to the request for the native resource using the system-scoped native resource. (column 13, lines 25-30)

As per claim 8, Czajkowski teaches

step (e) comprises: creating an instance of the requested native resource in the user isolation scope that corresponds to the instance of the requested resource located

in the system scope and responding to the request for the native resource using the instance of the resource created in the user isolation scope. (column 13, lines 20-30)

As per claim 9, Czajkowski teaches

the step of hooking a request for a native resource made by a process executing on behalf of a first user. (column 13, lines 15-22)

As per claim 10, Czajkowski teaches

the step of intercepting a request for a native resource executing on behalf of a first user. (column 13, lines 1-18; column 12, lines 10-15)

As per claim 11, Czajkowski teaches

the step of intercepting by a file system filter driver a request for a file system native resource executing on behalf of a first user. (column 13, lines 1-18; column 12, lines 10-15)

As per claim 12, Czajkowski teaches

step (a) comprises redirecting to an isolation environment comprising a user isolation scope and an application isolation scope a request for a file made by a process executing on behalf of a first user. (column 12, lines 19-37)

As per claim 13, Czajkowski teaches

step (a) comprises redirecting to an isolation environment comprising a user isolation scope and an application isolation scope a request for a registry database entry made by a process executing on behalf of a first user. (column 12, lines 19-37)

As per claim 14, Czajkowski teaches

(d) redirecting to the isolation environment a request for the native resource made by a second process executing on behalf of a second user; (column 13, lines 1-18; column 12, lines 10-15)

(e) locating an instance of the requested native resource in a second user isolation scope; (column 12, lines 48-60)

(f) and responding to the request for the native resource using the instance of the native resource located in the second user isolation scope. (column 12, lines 48-60)

As per claim 15, Czajkowski teaches

the process executes concurrently on behalf of a first user and a second user. (column 11, lines 34-45)

As per claim 16, Czajkowski teaches

step (e) comprises failing to locate an instance of the requested native resource in the second user isolation scope. (column 12, lines 19-37)

As per claim 17, Czajkowski teaches

step (f) comprises redirecting the request to the application isolation scope. (column 12, lines 19-37)

As per claim 18, Czajkowski teaches

(d) locating an instance of the requested resource in the application isolation scope; (column 13, lines 1-18; column 12, lines 10-15)

and (e) responding to the request for the native resource using the version of the native resource located in the application isolation scope. (column 13, lines 1-18; column 12, lines 10-15)

As per claim 19, Czajkowski teaches

(d) redirecting to the isolation environment a request for a native resource made by a second process executing on behalf of a first user; (column 12, lines 48-60)

(e) locating an instance of the requested native resource in the user isolation scope; (column 12, lines 48-60)

and (f) responding to the request for the native resource using the instance of the resource located in the user isolation scope. (column 12, lines 48-60)

As per claim 20, Czajkowski teaches

step (e) comprises failing to locate an instance of the requested native resource in the user isolation scope. (column 13, lines 1-18; column 12, lines 10-15)

As per claim 21, Czajkowski teaches

step (f) comprises redirecting the request to a second application isolation scope. (column 13, lines 1-18; column 12, lines 10-15)

As per claim 22, Czajkowski teaches

(d) locating an instance of the requested resource in the second application isolation scope; (column 13, lines 1-18; column 12, lines 10-15)

and (e) responding to the request for the native resource using the instance of the native resource located in the second application isolation scope. (column 13, lines 1-18; column 12, lines 10-15)

As per claim 23, Czajkowski teaches

An isolation environment for isolating access by application programs to native resources provided by an operating system, the isolation environment comprising: (see abstract and background)

a user isolation scope storing an instance of a native resource, the user isolation scope corresponding to a user; (fields prone to interference are replicated and isolated for each application, column 13, lines 10-18)

and a redirector intercepting a request for the native resource made by a process executing on behalf of the user and redirecting the request to the user isolation scope. (proper instance accessed based on application identity, column 13, lines 1-18)

As per claim 24, Czajkowski teaches

the isolation environment further comprises an application isolation scope storing an instance of the native resource. (column 13, lines 1-18; column 12, lines 10-15)

As per claim 25, Czajkowski teaches

the isolation environment further comprises a second application isolation scope storing an instance of the native resource. (column 13, lines 1-18; column 12, lines 10-15)

As per claim 26, Czajkowski teaches

the redirector returns a handle to the requesting process that identifies the native resource. (column 13, lines 15-30)

As per claim 27, Czajkowski teaches

a rules engine specifying behavior for the redirector when redirecting the request. (column 13, lines 10-15)

As per claim 28, Czajkowski teaches

the redirector comprises a file system filter driver. (column 13, lines 30-45)

As per claim 29, Czajkowski teaches

the redirector comprises a function hooking mechanism. (column 13, lines 30-45)

As per claim 30, Czajkowski teaches

the function hooking apparatus intercepts an operation selected from the group of file system operations, registry operations, operating system services, packing and installation services, named object operations, window operations, file-type association operations and Component Object Model (COM) server operations. (column 12, lines 10-15; column 13, lines 30-45)

As per claim 31, Czajkowski teaches

the application isolation environment further comprises a second user isolation scope storing a second instance of the native resource. (column 13, lines 1-18; column 12, lines 10-15)

As per claim 32, Czajkowski teaches

the application isolation environment further comprises a second user isolation scope storing an instance of the native resource, the second user isolation scope corresponding to a second user. (column 13, lines 1-18; column 12, lines 10-15)

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 6/11/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regards to Applicant's argument that Czajkowski does not disclose inter-process conflicts over operating system native resources, it is noted that Czajkowski discloses policy decisions concerning whether applications can write to a shared copy of system properties or if a separate copy is appropriate (column 14, lines 12-20). Therefore Czajkowski discloses the limitation.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jay A. Morrison whose telephone number is (571) 272-7112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim Vo can be reached on (571) 272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Jay Morrison
TC2100

Tim Vo
TC2100